


Q1



### REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 21 remain in this application as amended.

A typographical error has been corrected in the equation appearing at page 4, line 11. That is, the extra hydrogen atom on the aldehyde reactant has been removed. This correction does not involve new matter since page 4, line 8 identifies the reactant as an aldehyde and it is readily apparent that there is no hydrogen atom on the carbon atom of the carbonyl carbon since its presence would make the carbon atom an erroneous five-valent carbon.

The Office Action requires restriction between the following three groups of allegedly distinct inventions:

- (a) the compositions of claims 1 and 2;
- (b) the method of claims 3-17; and
- (c) the articles of claims 18-21.

Applicants hereby elect for further prosecution in this application the method claims of claims 3-17.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action provides no basis for patentable distinction between the compositions of claims 1-2 and the method of claims 3-17. Additionally, the Office Action alleges that the articles of claims 18-21 are distinct from the compositions of claims 1-2 since it is alleged that the compositions of claims 1-2 can be used in other articles, such as feeds. It is respectfully submitted that this position is unsupported by the USPTO as there is no showing by the USPTO that the compositions of claims 1-2 can be used in feeds. Thus, the restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action further alleges, without any support therefor, that the claims are directed to distinct species, i.e., species of evaporation, atomization and ionic dispersion and requires election of a species to which the claims shall be elected if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Solely to respond to this unsupported contention of distinct species, Applicants elect the evaporation species. Claims 3-17 are readable on the elected species.

The Office Action further alleges, without any support therefor, that the claims are also directed to distinct species of the claimed invention, i.e., with or without concurrent release of carbon dioxide, which is a known attractant. Again, solely to respond to this unsupported contention, Applicants elect the method with concurrent release of carbon dioxide. Claims 3-17 are all readable on this elected method since claims 3-12 are open, i.e., "comprising", method claims.

It is respectfully submitted that this response is a full and complete response to the Office Action of February 2, 2002 and it is further respectfully submitted that all the

elected claims are allowable over the prior art. An early indication of their allowability is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

George W. Rauchfuss, Jr.

Reg. No. 24,459

Attorney for Applicant

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, Tenth Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: (203) 327-4500  
Fax: (203) 327-6401

Date: March 7, 2002